



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,981	11/21/2003	Joshua D. Hug	109905-134283	1738
60380	7590	09/27/2007	EXAMINER	
STEVEN C. STEWART REALNETWORKS, INC. 2601 ELLIOTT AVENUE, SUITE 1000 SEATTLE, WA 98121			MURDOUGH, JOSHUA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/719,981	Applicant(s) HUG ET AL.	
Examiner Joshua Murdough	Art Unit 3609	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/25/2005, 12/10/2004.
- Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- Notice of Informal Patent Application
- Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear to the Examiner what the term “intrinsic” means in the context used. It has been interpreted to mean “residing on,” i.e. stored in memory. Although, other meanings could be construed, such as, the device being preloaded with usage when purchased.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 10-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Medvinsky (2005/0022019).

As to claim 1, Medvinsky shows:

In a client device, a method comprising:

Art Unit: 3609

receiving a request for playback of digital audio or video content stored on the device;

(Figure 4, 305 & Paragraph 0054; the decryption is an integral part of the presentation process and is done just prior to playing and therefore the request is for the content not the decryption in the eyes of the user.)

determining an allotted playback duration for the device; (Figure 4, 304)

determining an elapsed playback duration for the device, the elapsed playback duration representing an amount of time previously consumed by the device while rendering digital audio or video content; (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the “play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit)

determining whether a predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the device is satisfied; (Figure 4, 306) and

regulating playback of at least the requested digital audio or video content if the predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the device is determined to be satisfied. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 2, Medvinsky further shows:

the request for playback of digital audio or video content is received via a user input device. (Paragraph 0030, set-top box which allows for user input)

As to claim 3, Medvinsky further shows:

determining an elapsed playback duration for the device further comprises:

determining a current elapsed playback duration for the device; determining a

Art Unit: 3609

rendering time representing an amount of time it takes for the digital audio or video content to be rendered by the client device; and adding the rendering time to the current elapsed playback duration to obtain a new elapsed playback duration. (Figure 4, 305-307; If the “play time” in 306 were not updated in this manner, there would be an infinite loop created by these steps.)

As to claim 4, Medvinsky further shows:

playback of the requested digital audio or video content track is denied if it is determined that the relationship between the allotted playback duration and elapsed playback duration is satisfied. (Figure 4, 305-307; where the “part” 307 is understood to be a track)

As to claim 5, Medvinsky further shows:

facilitating playback of the digital audio content if it is determined that the elapsed playback duration does not exceed the allotted playback duration. (Figure 4, 305-307; decryption facilitates the playback)

As to claim 10, Medvinsky further shows:

denying playback of additional digital audio or video content stored on the device in addition to the requested digital audio or video content if it is determined that the elapsed playback duration is equal to or exceeds the allotted playback duration. (Figure 4, 306 & 314)

As to claim 11, Medvinsky further shows:

the allotted playback duration is determined based upon rights intrinsic to the device. (Paragraph 0038)

Art Unit: 3609

As to claim 12, Medvinsky further shows:

the allotted playback duration is determined based upon data received from the content rights server. (Paragraph 0050)

As to claim 13, Medvinsky further shows:

periodically increasing the allotted playback duration prior to the allotted playback duration exceeding the elapsed playback duration. (Paragraph 0042, As shown in the reference, the time is updated periodically with examples of 5 and 15 minutes given.)

As to claim 14, Medvinsky further shows:

the allotted playback duration is increased based upon entitlements granted to the user by a service provider. (Figure 4, 310-312, Multiple plays are allowed by the provider, and the effective playback duration is extended for each play used.)

As to claim 15, Medvinsky shows:

In a digital content rendering device, a method comprising:
rendering one of a plurality of audio or video content items; (Paragraph 0015)
determining an elapsed playback duration for which digital audio or video content has been rendered; (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the "play time" or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit) and
regulating further content rendering by the digital content rendering device if the elapsed playback duration satisfies a predetermined relationship with respect to an allotted playback duration. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 16, Medvinsky further shows:

Art Unit: 3609

the elapsed playback duration represents by an amount of time for which content has been rendered by the digital content rendering device. (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the “play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit)

As to claim 17, Medvinsky further shows:

the elapsed playback duration represents a quantity of data processed by the digital content rendering device to render content on the device. (Paragraph 0058)

As to claim 18, Medvinsky further shows:

regulating comprises denying further content rendering by the digital content rendering device if the elapsed playback duration satisfies a predetermined relationship with respect to the allotted playback duration. (Figure 4, 314)

As to claim 19, Medvinsky further shows:

the allotted playback duration represents at least one of an amount of render time for which content may be rendered on the digital content rendering device, and a quantity of data that may be processed by the digital content rendering device to render content on the device. (There is inherently a relationship between the playback duration and the quantity of data processed, known as bit rate, and therefore, the time of the playback represents the data processed.)

As to claim 20, Medvinsky further shows:

facilitating playback of the digital audio content if it is determined that the elapsed playback duration does not exceed the amount of render time corresponding to allotted playback right. (Figure 4, 300)

Art Unit: 3609

As to claim 21, Medvinsky further shows:

regulating further content rendering comprises facilitating content rendering at a reduced level of functionality or quality if the elapsed playback duration satisfies a predetermined relationship with respect to the allotted playback right.

(Paragraph 0060)

As to claim 22, Medvinsky shows:

In a digital content rendering device, a method comprising:

identifying a playback right associated with the digital content rendering device

representing an allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering device; (Figure 4, 304)

determining whether the allotted measure of content has been rendered by the device; (Figure 4, 306) and

preventing further content rendering on the digital content rendering device if it is determined that the allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering device has previously been rendered by the device. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 23, Medvinsky further shows:

the allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered represents an amount of time that the digital content rendering device may render the digital audio or video content. (Paragraph 0014)

As to claim 24, Medvinsky further shows:

Art Unit: 3609

the playback right associated with the digital content rendering device is further associated with a user, (Paragraph 0014) and wherein the user is denied playback of any additional content items by the digital content rendering device once it is determined that the allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering device has previously been rendered by the device. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 25, Medvinsky further shows:

the playback right is determined based upon a subscription agreement between the user and a content provider. (Paragraph 0041, A subscriber is mentioned, and in order to be a subscriber there has to be some agreement with the provider.)

As to claim 26, Medvinsky shows:

A digital content rendering apparatus comprising:

a storage medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored therein programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus to receive a request for playback of digital audio or video content stored on the apparatus, (Figure 4, 305 & Paragraph 0054; the decryption is an integral part of the presentation process and is done just prior to playing and therefore the request is for the content not the decryption in the eyes of the user.)

determine an allotted playback duration for the apparatus, (Figure 4, 304)

determine an elapsed playback duration for the apparatus, the elapsed playback duration representing an amount of time previously consumed by the apparatus while rendering digital audio or video content, (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the

Art Unit: 3609

“play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit)

determine whether a predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the apparatus is satisfied, (Figure 4, 306) and

regulate playback of at least the requested digital audio or video content if the predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the apparatus is determined to be satisfied; (Figure 4, 300) and

at least one processor coupled with the storage medium to execute the programming instructions. (Paragraphs 0068-0069)

As to claim 27, Medvinsky shows:

A digital content rendering apparatus comprising:

a storage medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored therein programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus to render one of a plurality of audio or video content items, (Paragraph 0015)

determine an elapsed playback duration for which digital audio or video content has been rendered, (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the “play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit) and

regulate further content rendering by the digital content rendering apparatus if the elapsed playback duration satisfies a predetermined relationship with respect to an

Art Unit: 3609

allotted playback duration; and at least one processor coupled with the storage medium to execute the programming instructions. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 28, Medvinsky shows:

A digital content rendering apparatus comprising:

a storage medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored therein programming instructions designed to enable the digital content rendering apparatus to identify a playback right associated with the digital content rendering apparatus representing an allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering apparatus, (Figure 4, 304)

determine whether the allotted measure of content has been rendered by the apparatus, (Figure 4, 306) and

prevent further content rendering on the digital content rendering apparatus if it is determined that the allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering apparatus has previously been rendered by the apparatus; (Figure 4, 300) and

at least one processor coupled with the storage medium to execute the programming instructions. (Paragraphs 0068-0069)

As to claim 29, Medvinsky shows:

A machine readable medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored thereon machine executable instructions, the execution of which to implement a method comprising:

Art Unit: 3609

receiving a request for playback of digital audio or video content stored on the device;

(Figure 4, 305 & Paragraph 0054; the decryption is an integral part of the presentation process and is done just prior to playing and therefore the request is for the content not the decryption in the eyes of the user.)

determining an allotted playback duration for the device; (Figure 4, 304)

determining an elapsed playback duration for the device, the elapsed playback duration representing an amount of time previously consumed by the device while rendering digital audio or video content; (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the “play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit)

determining whether a predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the device is satisfied; (Figure 4, 306) and

regulating playback of at least the requested digital audio or video content if the predetermined relationship between the elapsed playback duration and the allotted playback duration for the device is determined to be satisfied. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 30, Medvinsky shows:

A machine readable medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored thereon machine executable instructions, the execution of which to implement a method comprising:

rendering one of a plurality of audio or video content items; (Paragraph 0015)

Art Unit: 3609

determining an elapsed playback duration for which digital audio or video content has been rendered; (inherent to Figure 4, 306, the “play time” or playback duration has to be determined to compare it to the playback time limit) and regulating further content rendering by the digital content rendering device if the elapsed playback duration satisfies a predetermined relationship with respect to an allotted playback duration. (Figure 4, 300)

As to claim 31, Medvinsky shows:

A machine readable medium (Paragraph 0068) having stored thereon machine executable instructions, the execution of which to implement a method comprising:

identifying a playback right associated with the digital content rendering device representing an allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering device; (Figure 4, 304)

determining whether the allotted measure of content has been rendered by the device; (Figure 4, 306) and

preventing further content rendering on the digital content rendering device if it is determined that the allotted measure of digital audio or video content that may be rendered by the digital content rendering device has previously been rendered by the device. (Figure 4, 300)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3609

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medvinsky in view of Belknap (5,586,264).

As to claims 6 and 7, Medvinsky shows everything except explicitly showing the display of control values to the user.

Belknap shows the elapsed playback duration (Column 20, lines 6-7) and the allotted playback duration (Column 20, line 15) being shown to the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Medvinsky to include the displaying of this information for the purpose of allowing the user to make informed decisions during the playback in regards to the use of the remainder of the allotted time.

As to claim 8, Medvinsky further shows:

the digital audio or video content is encoded in accordance with at least one of an advanced audio encoding algorithm, an adaptive multi-rate encoding algorithm and an MP3 encoding algorithm. (Paragraph 0012, MPEG-4 is an adaptive multi-rate encoding algorithm.)

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medvinsky in view of Blonder (5,708,422).

Medvinsky shows all of the elements except:

Art Unit: 3609

denying playback of the requested digital audio or video content if the elapsed playback duration added to a run length associated with the requested content exceeds the allotted playback duration.

Blonder shows a credit account where an additional charge is not allowed if it would cause the account to go over its limit. (Column 12, lines 18-21) There is a strong correlation to the instant application. The time is paid for and creates a limit. As the time is used, the balance increases until it reaches the limit. Any transactions, additional viewing, that would cause the balance, elapsed time, to exceed the limit, allowed time, are therefore denied. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Medvinsky to include a transaction system as described by Blonder in order to prevent the usage of contents beyond the rights issued, which corresponds to not exceeding the limit. (Blonder, Column 12, lines 18-21)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Medvinsky (2004/0139312) is a related application to the one used above, and is included by reference therein.

Peterson (5,857,020) shows a similar system to that disclosed by Medvinsky.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Murdough whose telephone number is (571) 270-3270. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 3609

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on (571) 272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua Murdough


MATTHEW S. GART
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600